Larry, 2/3/73

With about 20 minutes before supper, let me try to give a little more meaning to a short note I've sent you about one Jose Luis Romero and the book one Camille Gilles is doing as his ghost for a French publisher who is making strenuous domestic efforts.

Several coincidences are involved.

The one that got me to taking some time was meeting a man who claims close friendship with the New editor of the London Sunday Times, which has a magazine section and used to pay rather decently. He had been told about me rather glowingly by some scholars I was with when he later came in. He offered to encourage this New editor, who went to jail on the thalidimde deal, you may remember, to take an interest in what I could write. Sol I wrote my agent in England, a very decent man who would be a blessing were he in that bsuiness in New York (and who has also been victimized by some of the crookedness I've suffered, so he knows it is not paranoia- and he knows when mail to him is inordinately delayed, like two months of it by air getting to him at one time). I've buzzed him on Romero because there may be an effort to get English publication and newspaper usage there is more probable, less in the Sunday Times than its competitors (which can mean an interest later if there is initial rejection).

There are remarkable parallele to the Warren Report and the Sherman Special, crazy as Sherman, Farewell America. The major difference is that someone seems to have learned a lesson from Farewell and will not again manufacture a libellous work. The could not get commercial publication anywhere and could get no distribution of the edition printed in Belgium. Why else would or could the crazies like your Skolnick be the handlers?

Absolutely fantastic sums were invested in that book. I could live well for several years on what I know was spent on post-printing travel alone. There was no hope of getting any of it back, none from the outset, and this you should keep in mind. If you doubt, get a copy and read it.

The guy in apparent charge went by the name Herve Lamarre. He used the pen name James Hepburn, which he told me he took because he had a think on Audrey, so j'aime Hepburn. It was aimed right at Garrison. I thought I'd killed it twice only to find it had run full cycle. I first ran into it in California, before he got it, under the most dubious circumstances, after Mexican connections that served no need and other manufactured mysteries in cheap imitation of the spook craft. Later, when he had it and apparently had some doubts, but loved it, he said he wanted me to read it. He then avoided giving it to me until I was ready to leave for the plane, when he had one chapter xeroxed. I read it on the plane and blew it as soon as I got home, from notes made while flying. He never mentioned it again, but he went for it. he got them to change the name to what it is, from L'Amerique Brule.

When the time came when I wanted to accept a standing invitation to go see Hunt (H.L., that is), I got a complete copy of the ms and didn t do hat in hand. I never read the ms. copy, aside from the one chapter. I have read the printed book. Lamarre personally gave me the copy I have, with a few pages cut out. I met him when he was here with their movie of the same name. Now for this they had a better print of the Zapruder film than the Archives had, plus a poor copy I'm sure was copied from the madeup one Life did for Garrison. It has the same built-in identifying vharacteristics that are visbile to the amateur. Only the nuts would not have seen or not heeded when shown.

Lamarre, who was educated as an economist, was editor of a woman's fashion magazine and is known in Texas for oil dealings. He is not an oil man. I think he is a typical spook, accented and pink-cheeked. Suave, sophisticated, etc. right guy.

I can't take time for all the details, but there is no possibility of doubt of official French connection here. There is doubt about my view, that it was a combined job, with CIA. Whether or not the original concept included arranging a mistrial in the Shaw case, which I am not alone in believing, it certainly was a massive attack on the credibility of all assassination criticism and makes the CIA look much maligned. The same is true of Romero, the origins of which parallel Watergate developments, the first news break coinciding with the time the trial would have begun had there been no delays. No part of the Romero story stacks. No part isn't an automatic self-destruct, but that never deters publishers. I know more of this than I can say now....Anyway, you may have a better idea of my interest.

Best,